IJGGSD
ISSN: 3155-7716
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.123

School Heads' Instructional Evidenced-Based Feedback Practices and Teachers' Reflective Teaching: Developmental Supervision Model

Rejie P. De Los Santos
Master of Arts in Education Major in Administration and Supervision, Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, R. Palma St., Cebu City, Philippines

Email: rejie.delossantos@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices as foundations for developing a Developmental Supervision Model. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design with a developmental component was employed, involving 30 school heads and 150 teachers from 30 randomly selected public secondary schools in Southern Leyte, Philippines, during School Year 2026–2027. Data were collected using validated parallel questionnaires and analyzed through descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. Findings revealed that both instructional feedback and reflective teaching practices were manifested to a very great extent, although critical examination of instructional decisions emerged as the weakest reflective teaching dimension. School heads' age and training level were significantly associated with instructional feedback practices, while teachers' professional rank, teaching experience, and training-related characteristics were significantly associated with reflective teaching practices. A significant positive relationship was established between instructional feedback and reflective teaching ($r = 0.364$, $p < 0.001$). Major challenges included limited supervisory time, competing workloads, evaluative perceptions of feedback, and difficulties sustaining instructional improvements. The study concluded that developmental supervision and reflective teaching are interconnected professional practices requiring structured and sustained support. Expert validation and pilot implementation of the proposed REFINE Developmental Supervision Model are recommended. The study's localized setting, questionnaire-based assessments, and correlational design limit generalizability and causal interpretation. The proposed model provides an empirical framework for strengthening instructional leadership, professional learning, and continuous instructional improvement, supporting educational and institutional sustainability aligned with Sustainable Development Goals 4 (Quality Education) and 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions).

Keywords: *Developmental Supervision, Instructional Feedback, Instructional Leadership, Professional Development, Reflective Teaching, School Heads, Secondary Education*

1. INTRODUCTION

Improving classroom instruction remains a fundamental priority in basic education, with school heads playing a vital role in strengthening teachers' professional competence through instructional supervision. Beyond classroom observation and performance evaluation, meaningful feedback enables teachers to recognize strengths, identify areas for improvement, and make appropriate instructional adjustments. Poulou et al. (2023) emphasized the value of evidence-based performance feedback in instructional improvement, while Ruelmann et al. (2023) highlighted the importance of clear expectations, performance information, and improvement strategies. Lavigne et al. (2023) demonstrated the significance of post-observation conferences in facilitating professional dialogue, while Flores et al. (2024) emphasized collaboration, reflection, and continuing support in translating improvement goals into classroom practices. Closely associated with instructional feedback is reflective teaching, which involves systematically examining instructional experiences, pedagogical decisions, learner responses, and learning outcomes. Reflective practice promotes critical self-evaluation, professional growth, and continuous instructional improvement (Baluchzada, 2023; Li, 2025). To et al. (2023) emphasized collaboration, experimentation, and reflection in developing feedback literacy, while Badillo-Tello and Cano-García (2026) highlighted the integration of feedback and professional dialogue in strengthening teacher reflection. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (2025a, 2025b) reinforces standards-based professional development through policies emphasizing instructional feedback, coaching, reflection, and continuing professional growth. Within this context, the present study examined school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices in selected public secondary schools in Southern Leyte during School Year 2026–2027. It aimed to establish empirical foundations for a Developmental Supervision Model integrating classroom observation, constructive feedback, critical reflection, collaborative goal setting, and continuing professional support.

Research Problem

Despite its recognized importance, instructional supervision does not necessarily result in sustained instructional improvement. Organizational constraints, administrative responsibilities, limited professional dialogue, and insufficient follow-up support may undermine its developmental value. Etorne (2023) identified practical challenges affecting instructional supervision, while Ramos and Anonuevo (2024) documented school heads' classroom observation experiences. Locsin (2025) likewise emphasized the need to strengthen supervisory assistance before and after classroom observation. Philippine studies have predominantly examined instructional supervision in relation to teacher performance and professional development. Godes and Dioso (2024) investigated supervisory practices and teacher performance, while Octobre and Andal (2025) examined clinical supervision and teachers' professional growth. Leysa and Baynosa (2026) developed an enhanced instructional supervisory plan, whereas Afable and Rapada (2026) explored instructional supervision and teachers' work performance. Furthermore, Paiste et al. (2026) emphasized constructive feedback, reflection, mentoring, and collaboration, while Jamisola and Villanueva (2026) highlighted school heads' responsibilities in supporting teachers' professional advancement. Although these studies establish the importance of instructional supervision, limited empirical attention has been given to the relationship between school heads' specific instructional feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices, particularly in Southern Leyte. Addressing this research gap provides a foundation for developing a context-responsive Developmental Supervision Model that integrates evidence-based feedback, critical reflection, instructional improvement, and continuous professional development beyond conventional performance monitoring.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was anchored on the assumption that instructional supervision becomes developmental when school heads provide meaningful, evidence-based, constructive, and actionable feedback that encourages teachers to critically examine and improve their professional practices. Effective teacher development requires appropriate learning mechanisms and opportunities to apply and sustain professional learning within instructional practice (Sims et al., 2025). It was further assumed that teachers actively interpret instructional feedback through reflection, self-evaluation, professional dialogue, and instructional adjustment. The developmental value of feedback therefore depends not only on its provision but also on teachers' capacity and willingness to translate feedback into meaningful professional action (Flores et al., 2024; Li, 2025). The study also considered that respondent characteristics, including demographic background, professional preparation, position, years of service, and relevant training, may be associated with variations in instructional feedback and reflective teaching practices. Accordingly, three null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance: there is no significant relationship between school heads' profiles and their instructional evidence-based feedback practices; there is no significant relationship between teachers' profiles and their reflective teaching practices; and there is no significant relationship between school heads' instructional feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices.

Objectives of the Study

The study generally aimed to determine the extent of school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices in selected public secondary schools in the Department of Education Schools Division of Southern Leyte during School Year 2026–2027 as a basis for developing a Developmental Supervision Model. Specifically, it sought to describe the respondents' profiles in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, position or rank, years of service, and relevant training and professional development. It also aimed to determine the extent of school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices in terms of timeliness and regularity, specificity and clarity, evidence-based feedback, constructive and dialogic feedback, actionable recommendations and goal setting, and follow-up and continuing support. Furthermore, the study examined teachers' reflective teaching practices in terms of self-evaluation of teaching, reflection on learner responses and learning outcomes, critical examination of instructional decisions, modification and improvement of teaching strategies, application of feedback to instructional practice, and continuous professional learning. It sought to establish the significant relationships between respondents' profiles and their respective professional practices and between school heads' instructional feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices. Finally, the study identified the issues and challenges encountered in the provision, reception, and utilization of instructional feedback and developed an empirically grounded Developmental Supervision Model responsive to the professional development needs of school heads and teachers.

Theoretical or Conceptual Basis

The study is anchored on three complementary perspectives: Developmental Supervision Theory, Reflective Practice Theory, and Feedback Intervention Theory, which explain the interconnectedness of instructional supervision, professional feedback, teacher reflection, and instructional improvement. Developmental Supervision Theory, as presented by Glickman et al. (2024), views instructional supervision as a collaborative and developmental process responsive to teachers' professional competence, experience, and learning needs. It emphasizes directive, collaborative, and nondirective supervisory approaches that support constructive dialogue, collaborative goal setting, and continuing professional guidance. Reflective Practice Theory,

originally advanced by Donald Schön, emphasizes the systematic examination of professional experiences and instructional decisions. Lefebvre et al. (2023) highlighted reflection before, during, and after teaching, while Philp-Clark and Grieshaber (2024) emphasized critical examination of instructional practices. Li (2025) further demonstrated the value of structured reflection and feedback in strengthening pedagogical competence and professional growth. Feedback Intervention Theory, originally developed by Kluger and DeNisi, explains how feedback effectiveness depends on its content, focus, and interpretation. Ruelmann et al. (2023) emphasized performance-focused feedback and improvement strategies, while Poulou et al. (2023) highlighted evidence-based classroom observation. Badillo-Tello and Cano-García (2026) further emphasized professional dialogue in connecting feedback with teacher reflection. Integrating these perspectives, the study conceptualizes developmental supervision as a continuous cycle of classroom observation, evidence-based feedback, professional dialogue, critical reflection, collaborative goal setting, instructional adjustment, and continuing support. This framework is reinforced by the Department of Education (2025a, 2025b), which promotes standards-based performance management, coaching, mentoring, and professional development. Collectively, these foundations support the examination of instructional feedback and reflective teaching practices and the development of the proposed Developmental Supervision Model.

The study primarily aligns with SDG 4 – Quality Education, particularly Targets 4.1 and 4.c, through its emphasis on instructional quality, teacher competence, and continuing professional development. UNESCO and the International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030 (2024) emphasized strengthening teacher support and professional development to advance inclusive and equitable quality education. The study also complements SDG 16 – Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, particularly Target 16.6, through evidence-based supervision, professional accountability, and institutional effectiveness. From a sustainability perspective, the proposed Developmental Supervision Model supports educational and institutional sustainability through continuous professional learning, collaborative instructional improvement, reflective practice, and responsive school leadership. It promotes a developmental approach that extends beyond performance evaluation toward sustained professional growth and instructional quality. These alignments represent the study's potential contributions rather than directly measured SDG outcomes.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design with a developmental component. The descriptive approach determined the respondents' profiles, the extent of school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices, teachers' reflective teaching practices, and the issues and challenges encountered in instructional supervision. The correlational approach examined the relationships between respondents' profiles and their respective professional practices, as well as between school heads' instructional feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices. The variables were examined within their natural settings without experimental manipulation; therefore, significant relationships were interpreted as associations rather than causal effects. The developmental component integrated the empirical findings, identified areas for improvement, significant relationships, and instructional supervision challenges as foundations for the proposed Developmental Supervision Model. The study followed the Input–Process–Output (IPO) framework to organize the research variables, data collection, statistical analysis, and development of the proposed model.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in 30 randomly selected public secondary schools under the Department of Education Schools Division of Southern Leyte, Philippines, during School Year 2026–2027. The participating schools represented varied educational settings in terms of geographical location, school size, and institutional context. These schools provided an appropriate environment for examining instructional supervision, classroom observation, professional feedback, reflective teaching, and continuing professional development. The participating schools were randomly selected from the official list of eligible public secondary schools within the division.

Participants or Data Sources

The study involved 180 respondents comprising 30 school heads and 150 teachers from 30 selected public secondary schools. A two-stage sampling procedure was employed. Initially, 30 public secondary schools were randomly selected from the official list of eligible schools. Subsequently, total enumeration was applied to the school heads of the selected schools, while five teachers from each participating school were selected through simple random sampling. School heads provided self-assessments of their instructional feedback practices and assessments of teachers' reflective teaching practices. Teachers evaluated the instructional feedback practices of their respective school heads and provided self-assessments of their reflective teaching practices. Including both respondent groups enabled the study to obtain complementary perspectives from the providers and recipients of instructional feedback.

Research Instruments or Materials

The study utilized two parallel adapted survey questionnaires for school heads and teachers, each comprising four parts. Part I gathered demographic and professional information, including sex, age, educational attainment, position or rank, professional experience, and relevant training and professional development. Part II consisted of 36 indicators assessing six dimensions of instructional evidence-based feedback practices: timeliness and regularity, specificity and clarity, evidence-based feedback, constructive and dialogic feedback, actionable recommendations and goal setting, and follow-up and continuing support. The indicators were adapted from the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020), Glickman et al. (2018), Kluger and DeNisi (1996), Lavigne et al. (2023), Poulou et al. (2023), and Ruelmann et al. (2023). Part III comprised 36 indicators measuring six dimensions of reflective teaching practices: self-evaluation, reflection on learner responses and learning outcomes, critical examination of instructional decisions, modification of teaching strategies, application of feedback, and continuous professional learning. The indicators were adapted from Naui et al. (2025), Schön's (1983, 1987) Reflective Practice Theory, the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd, 2017), Li (2025), and Badillo-Tello and Cano-García (2025). Part IV contained 15 indicators assessing challenges in the provision, reception, and utilization of instructional feedback, including workload, time constraints, professional communication, receptiveness, trust, resources, and continuing support. The indicators were adapted from Glickman et al. (2018), Lavigne et al. (2023), Poulou et al. (2023), and Ruelmann et al. (2023), and aligned with the PPSSH (DepEd, 2020). A five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (Very Great Extent) to 1 (Very Low Extent) measured instructional feedback and reflective teaching practices, while challenges were assessed from 5 (Very Great Challenge) to 1 (Not a Challenge). Both instruments underwent expert validation and pilot testing. Three qualified experts evaluated the indicators' relevance, clarity, and alignment with the research objectives, yielding a reported validity index (IVI) of 1.00. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for Parts II, III, and IV exceeded 0.70, indicating acceptable internal consistency.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, the researcher secured approval from the appropriate school authorities and permission from the Schools Division Office and school heads of the participating secondary schools. Coordination was subsequently undertaken to establish the schedules and arrangements for questionnaire administration. The respondents were informed of the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of their participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. The validated questionnaires were administered separately to school heads and teachers, who were given sufficient time to respond based on their actual professional experiences and practices. Upon retrieval, the accomplished questionnaires were checked for completeness without compromising respondents' anonymity. Responses were subsequently coded, tabulated, organized according to the research variables, and subjected to appropriate statistical analyses.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to analyze the data. Frequency counts and percentages summarized categorical profile variables, while means and standard deviations described numerical characteristics. Weighted means and standard deviations determined the extent of instructional feedback practices, reflective teaching practices, and instructional feedback challenges. School heads' and teachers' assessments were analyzed separately to preserve their respective perspectives. Mean scores were interpreted using five intervals: 4.21–5.00 (Very Great Extent/Challenge), 3.41–4.20 (Great Extent/Challenge), 2.61–3.40 (Moderate Extent/Challenge), 1.81–2.60 (Low Extent/Minor Challenge), and 1.00–1.80 (Very Low Extent/Not a Challenge). Eta correlation (η) examined associations involving categorical variables, while Spearman rank-order correlation (ρ) assessed relationships involving ordinal variables. Pearson product-moment correlation (r) examined relationships involving quantitative variables and the two major research variables. Statistical significance was established at the 0.05 level, with null hypotheses rejected when the p-value was below 0.05. The findings served as the empirical basis for developing the proposed Developmental Supervision Model.

Ethical Consideration

The study adhered to ethical research principles, ensuring informed participation, voluntariness, privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality. Respondents were informed of the research objectives and their right to decline or withdraw without adverse consequences. Individual responses were not disclosed to unauthorized persons or used for performance evaluation or administrative action. Findings were reported in aggregate form to protect respondents' identities.

Research data were securely managed and utilized exclusively for legitimate research purposes in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). Research integrity, accurate reporting, and proper acknowledgment of theoretical foundations, instruments, and supporting literature were maintained throughout the study.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Demographic and Professional Profile of the Respondents

3.1.1 Profile of School Heads

Among the 30 school heads, 56.7% were female, with a mean age of 51.6 years. Regarding educational attainment, 43.3% held master's degrees, while 23.3% had earned doctoral units. Principal I constituted the largest position category (33.3%), followed by Head Teacher II (30.0%). Approximately 43.3% had one to five years of leadership experience, while 53.3% had attended one to five professional development activities and identified regional-level training as their highest training exposure. The findings indicate that school heads generally possessed

professional maturity and graduate-level qualifications but varied in leadership experience and professional development exposure. These characteristics underscore the need for differentiated capacity-building, particularly in evidence-based feedback, instructional coaching, mentoring, and supervisory competence.

3.1.2 Profile of Teachers

Among the 150 teachers, 66.0% were female, with a mean age of 39.7 years. Most held bachelor's degrees (40.7%) or had earned master's units (37.3%). Teacher III constituted the largest position category (36.7%), followed by Teacher I (34.0%). Approximately 46.0% had six to ten years of teaching experience, while 80.0% had attended one to five professional development activities. Division-level training represented the highest training exposure for 58.0% of respondents. The findings indicate that teachers were predominantly in the early to middle stages of their professional careers, highlighting the need for sustained professional development. Montoya Bravo et al. (2026) emphasized the relationship among professional experience, reflective practice, and practical teaching knowledge, while Gonio and Bauyot (2024) highlighted mentorship, collaboration, and reflection. Dayagbil and Alda (2024) identified workload, time constraints, and insufficient funding as barriers to professional development. Similarly, Sims et al. (2025) emphasized sustained professional learning to strengthen instructional competence and the application of acquired practices.

3.2 Extent of School Heads' Instructional Evidence-Based Feedback Practices

3.2.1 Timeliness and Regularity

Timeliness and regularity were assessed to a Very Great Extent by school heads (M = 4.28, SD = 0.37) and teachers (M = 4.34, SD = 0.88). Both groups recognized the prompt provision of instructional feedback following classroom observation. However, providing feedback regularly rather than only when instructional concerns arise received comparatively lower ratings, particularly among school heads (M = 4.13). The findings demonstrate the importance of providing feedback while classroom experiences remain relevant and readily available for reflection. Levi-Nielsen et al. (2026), through a systematic review and meta-analysis, established that performance feedback involving classroom observation and professional guidance is an evidence-based teacher development strategy. Similarly, Sims et al. (2025) emphasized sustained professional development mechanisms that facilitate the application of instructional improvements. These findings support the incorporation of scheduled feedback conferences, regular instructional coaching, and systematic follow-up into developmental supervision.

3.2.2 Specificity and Clarity

Specificity and clarity were assessed to a Very Great Extent by both school heads (M = 4.39, SD = 0.47) and teachers (M = 4.39, SD = 0.91). School heads gave their highest rating to relating feedback to specific classroom situations (M = 4.57), while teachers highly recognized the use of precise and understandable language (M = 4.43). Distinguishing effective instructional practices from those requiring modification received the lowest ratings from school heads (M = 4.27) and teachers (M = 4.33). The findings indicate that school heads generally provide clear and specific instructional feedback, although further attention is needed to distinguish instructional strengths from improvement priorities. Brummer et al. (2024), in a meta-analysis of digitally delivered educational feedback, emphasized the importance of feedback content, context, and process-related information. Although conducted in a different feedback setting, these findings support the broader value of informative feedback. Likewise, de Kleijn (2023) emphasized feedback processes that enable recipients to recognize performance gaps, interpret information, and undertake appropriate improvement actions.

3.2.3 Evidence-Based Feedback

Evidence-based feedback was manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by school heads (M = 4.42, SD = 0.51) and teachers (M = 4.42, SD = 0.88). School heads gave their highest ratings to using actual classroom evidence and considering lesson objectives, instructional activities, materials, and assessment practices (M = 4.57 each). Teachers likewise highly rated the consideration of essential instructional components (M = 4.47). However, incorporating learner responses and engagement received the lowest rating from school heads (M = 4.23), while citing specific classroom observations obtained the lowest teacher rating (M = 4.39). The findings demonstrate that instructional feedback is generally grounded in classroom evidence rather than personal impressions. Levi-Nielsen et al. (2026) established the developmental value of observation-based performance feedback in strengthening teachers' professional practices. Furthermore, Brummer et al. (2024) emphasized the relevance of feedback information to the process being improved. These findings reinforce the importance of systematic classroom documentation, learner engagement monitoring, and the explicit communication of observational evidence during feedback conferences.

3.2.4 Constructive and Dialogic Feedback

Constructive and dialogic feedback was assessed to a Very Great Extent by school heads (M = 4.48, SD = 0.51) and teachers (M = 4.42, SD = 0.88). Respectful and professionally supportive communication received the highest ratings from school heads (M = 4.57) and teachers (M = 4.51). Meanwhile, providing teachers with opportunities to ask questions and clarify feedback received the lowest ratings from school heads (M = 4.37) and teachers (M = 4.35). The findings indicate that professional respect and supportive communication are established strengths of instructional supervision, although teachers' active participation in feedback discussions warrants further attention. De Kleijn (2023) emphasized supportive interactions that enable recipients to interpret and utilize feedback effectively. Similarly, Carless (2023) highlighted the importance of feedback uptake, reflection, and iterative improvement in developing feedback literacy. These perspectives support two-way professional dialogue, teacher-led reflection, clarification of instructional concerns, and collaborative identification of improvement strategies.

3.2.5 Actionable Recommendations and Goal Setting

Actionable recommendations and goal setting were manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by school heads (M = 4.38, SD = 0.56) and teachers (M = 4.37, SD = 0.90). Both respondent groups highly recognized the provision of realistic and applicable recommendations addressing instructional improvement needs. However, collaborative formulation of instructional improvement goals received comparatively lower ratings, particularly among teachers (M = 4.31). The findings indicate that instructional recommendations are generally practical and responsive to teachers' professional needs, although collaborative goal setting requires further strengthening. Levi-Nielsen et al. (2026) established the effectiveness of performance feedback as a professional development strategy, while Sims et al. (2025) emphasized the importance of developing teaching techniques and supporting their sustained implementation. These findings highlight the value of collaboratively established improvement goals, documented instructional action plans, and continuing supervisory assistance.

3.2.6 Follow-Up and Continuing Support

Follow-up and continuing support were assessed to a Very Great Extent by both school heads (M = 4.31, SD = 0.49) and teachers (M = 4.31, SD = 0.88). Recognizing instructional improvements and providing additional guidance when difficulties arise were among the highly rated practices. However, monitoring teachers' progress and determining whether agreed instructional

recommendations had been implemented received comparatively lower ratings. The findings suggest that continuing supervisory support is generally evident, although systematic progress monitoring and documentation of instructional improvements require further attention. LaBrot et al. (2024) examined the extent to which teachers transfer practices acquired through school-based consultation and coaching to other situations. Their findings support attention to the sustained application of professional learning. Similarly, Sims et al. (2025) emphasized professional development mechanisms that promote the continued implementation of newly acquired instructional practices. These findings reinforce the importance of follow-up conferences, progress-monitoring tools, instructional coaching, and mentoring.

3.2.7 Overall Extent of Instructional Evidence-Based Feedback Practices

School heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices were generally manifested to a Very Great Extent, with reported overall means of 4.33 (SD = 0.49) among school heads and 4.32 (SD = 0.88) among teachers. Constructive and dialogic feedback obtained the highest rating from school heads (M = 4.48), while evidence-based feedback and constructive and dialogic feedback received the highest teacher ratings (M = 4.42 each). Timeliness and regularity obtained the lowest school head rating (M = 4.28), whereas follow-up and continuing support received the lowest teacher rating (M = 4.31). The findings demonstrate that school heads generally implement constructive, evidence-based, and professionally supportive instructional supervision. However, maintaining feedback regularity and systematically monitoring instructional improvements remain important developmental priorities. Levi-Nielsen et al. (2026) emphasized the effectiveness of performance feedback in improving teaching practices, while Brummer et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of feedback content and its relevance to learning processes. Furthermore, Sims et al. (2025) reinforced the importance of sustained professional development mechanisms. Collectively, these findings support a developmental supervision approach integrating classroom observation, meaningful feedback, professional dialogue, collaborative goal setting, and continuing instructional support.

3.3 Extent of Teachers' Reflective Teaching Practices

3.3.1 Self-Evaluation of Teaching

Teachers' self-evaluation practices were manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by teachers (M = 4.33, SD = 0.62) and school heads (M = 4.25, SD = 0.48). Teachers gave their highest rating to utilizing self-evaluation results in planning subsequent instruction (M = 4.39). However, systematically examining instructional delivery after teaching received comparatively lower ratings, particularly from school heads (M = 4.13), interpreted as Great Extent. The findings indicate that teachers generally recognize the importance of self-evaluation in instructional planning, although systematic post-lesson reflection requires further strengthening. Tay et al. (2023) emphasized transformative reflection as a mechanism for improving teaching practices, while Hikmat et al. (2023) highlighted reflective practice in promoting continuous instructional innovation. Lefebvre et al. (2023) demonstrated the developmental potential of structured reflection using teaching logs and classroom recordings. Similarly, Philp-Clark and Grieshaber (2024) emphasized the importance of moving beyond routine reflection toward critical examination of professional practices. These findings support the integration of structured reflective journals, post-lesson evaluation, and collaborative professional reflection into instructional supervision.

3.3.2 Reflection on Learner Responses and Learning Outcomes

Reflection on learner responses and learning outcomes was manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by teachers (M = 4.40, SD = 0.56) and school heads (M = 4.37, SD = 0.55). Both groups highly recognized teachers' consideration of learners' understanding and assessment

information when evaluating instructional effectiveness. However, examining variations in learner performance and determining the appropriateness of instructional approaches received comparatively lower ratings. The findings indicate that teachers generally consider learner responses and learning outcomes when reflecting on instructional effectiveness. Jazby et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of noticing and interpreting learners' thinking in instructional decision-making. Similarly, Barnhart et al. (2025) demonstrated that recognizing learners' thinking does not automatically translate into appropriate instructional responses, underscoring the need to strengthen responsive teaching practices. Lee et al. (2024) highlighted teachers' data literacy in collecting, interpreting, and utilizing assessment information, while Pastore (2023) emphasized assessment literacy as a foundation for informed instructional decisions. These findings support evidence-informed reflection and collaborative analysis of learner performance.

3.3.3 Critical Examination of Instructional Decisions

Critical examination of instructional decisions received a Very Great Extent rating from teachers (M = 4.25, SD = 0.54) but a Great Extent rating from school heads (M = 4.13, SD = 0.39). Teachers highly recognized reconsidering instructional decisions when classroom experiences indicated the need for improvement (M = 4.31). Nevertheless, critically examining the reasoning and assumptions underlying instructional decisions received comparatively lower assessments from both respondent groups. The findings indicate that critical examination of instructional decisions remains the weakest dimension of teachers' reflective teaching practices. Although teachers generally reconsider instructional approaches, deeper examination of pedagogical assumptions and professional judgments requires further development. Tay et al. (2023) emphasized reflective inquiry as a mechanism for transforming instructional practices, while Philp-Clark and Grieshaber (2024) highlighted the importance of moving beyond descriptive reflection toward critical professional examination. These findings support the inclusion of structured reflective questioning, evidence-based instructional analysis, and collaborative examination of pedagogical decisions within developmental supervision.

3.3.4 Modification and Improvement of Teaching Strategies

Modification and improvement of teaching strategies were manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by teachers (M = 4.32, SD = 0.51) and school heads (M = 4.24, SD = 0.37). Teachers gave their highest rating to improving instructional materials based on previous classroom experiences (M = 4.40), while school heads highly recognized adjustments in assessment practices based on reflection (M = 4.37). However, experimenting with alternative instructional approaches and improving instructional materials received comparatively lower ratings in the respective assessments. The findings demonstrate that teachers generally translate reflective experiences into modifications of instructional materials, teaching strategies, and assessment practices. Veugen et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of formative assessment in supporting instructional adjustments and co-regulated learning. Velasquez et al. (2023) highlighted reflective teaching as an important mechanism for strengthening teachers' professional competence. Similarly, Nhi and Thi (2026) identified collaborative reflection, technology-supported reflective practices, and structured teacher education as strategies for strengthening professional development. These findings reinforce the value of instructional experimentation, reflective planning, and continuous evaluation of modified teaching strategies.

3.3.5 Application of Feedback to Instructional Practice

The application of feedback to instructional practice was manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by teachers (M = 4.30, SD = 0.64) and school heads (M = 4.28, SD = 0.63). Both respondent groups highly recognized teachers' careful consideration of instructional feedback.

However, incorporating feedback recommendations into subsequent lessons and monitoring whether feedback-related changes improved classroom instruction received lower ratings. School heads particularly rated the incorporation of recommendations into subsequent lessons at a Great Extent (M = 4.03). The findings indicate that teachers generally demonstrate receptiveness to instructional feedback, although translating recommendations into sustained instructional changes remains a developmental concern. Poulou et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of observation-based professional feedback in strengthening instructional practices, while To et al. (2023) highlighted feedback literacy development through professional learning, experimentation, and collaboration. Similarly, Gross Toews et al. (2024) demonstrated the value of continuing practice-based feedback in supporting the implementation of instructional interventions. These findings reinforce the importance of systematic follow-up, instructional coaching, and progress monitoring to strengthen feedback utilization.

3.3.6 Continuous Professional Learning

Continuous professional learning was manifested to a Very Great Extent, as assessed by teachers (M = 4.31, SD = 0.59) and school heads (M = 4.34, SD = 0.63). Both groups recognized teachers' participation in professional learning activities and efforts to improve instructional competence. However, identifying professional learning needs through classroom reflection received comparatively lower ratings from teachers (M = 4.24) and school heads (M = 4.23). The findings indicate that teachers generally participate in professional development activities, although stronger connections between reflective practice and professional learning needs are necessary. Sims et al. (2025) emphasized professional development mechanisms that strengthen teaching techniques and promote sustained instructional improvement. Similarly, Montoya Bravo et al. (2026) highlighted the interconnectedness of professional experience, reflective practice, and practical teaching knowledge. These findings support reflective professional needs assessment, individualized professional development planning, Learning Action Cells (LACs), and continuing instructional coaching.

3.3.7 Overall Extent of Teachers' Reflective Teaching Practices

Teachers' reflective teaching practices were generally manifested to a Very Great Extent, with reported overall means of 4.33 (SD = 0.51) among teachers and 4.36 (SD = 0.64) among school heads. Reflection on learner responses and learning outcomes obtained the highest ratings from teachers (M = 4.40) and school heads (M = 4.37). Conversely, critical examination of instructional decisions obtained the lowest ratings from teachers (M = 4.25) and school heads (M = 4.13). The findings demonstrate that reflective teaching practices are generally evident, particularly in evaluating learner responses and learning outcomes. Nevertheless, teachers' capacity to critically examine the reasoning and assumptions underlying instructional decisions warrants further development. Lee et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of teachers' capacity to interpret and utilize instructional data, while Philp-Clark and Grieshaber (2024) highlighted deeper critical reflection as essential to professional learning. These findings support a Developmental Supervision Model emphasizing evidence-based reflection, critical instructional inquiry, collaborative improvement planning, and continuous professional development.

3.4 Significant Relationships Among the Variables

3.4.1 Relationship Between School Heads' Profiles and Instructional Evidence-Based Feedback Practices

Correlation analysis revealed that school heads' level of training was significantly and positively associated with instructional evidence-based feedback practices (reported coefficient = 0.593, p = 0.001). Age exhibited a significant negative relationship (r = −0.426, p = 0.019). Meanwhile, sex (reported coefficient = 0.081, p = 0.670), highest educational attainment (reported coefficient

= 0.171, p = 0.366), position or rank (reported coefficient = 0.072, p = 0.707), leadership experience (r = −0.027, p = 0.886), and number of relevant professional development activities (r = 0.226, p = 0.230) demonstrated no statistically significant relationships. Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected for age and level of training but was not rejected for the remaining profile variables. The findings suggest that higher levels of training exposure are associated with more extensive instructional feedback practices, while older school heads tended to report comparatively lower feedback practice ratings. Stosich et al. (2024) emphasized collaborative and context-responsive professional learning in strengthening instructional leadership, while He et al. (2024) established the relevance of principals' instructional leadership to teachers' professional development. Similarly, Dorukbaşi and Cansoy (2024) highlighted professional learning in the relationship between instructional leadership and teaching practices. These findings support differentiated supervisory capacity-building responsive to school heads' professional development needs across career stages. However, the relationships do not establish that age or training level directly causes differences in supervisory competence.

3.4.2 Relationship Between Teachers' Profiles and Reflective Teaching Practices

Significant positive relationships were established between teachers' reflective teaching practices and teaching experience (r = 0.305, p < 0.001), level of training (reported coefficient = 0.230, p = 0.005), position or rank (reported coefficient = 0.183, p = 0.025), and number of relevant training and professional development activities (r = 0.176, p = 0.031). Conversely, sex (reported coefficient = 0.027, p = 0.747), age (r = −0.014, p = 0.864), and highest educational attainment (reported coefficient = 0.049, p = 0.550) demonstrated no statistically significant relationships. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected for teaching experience, training level, position or rank, and number of relevant training activities but was not rejected for the other profile variables. The findings indicate that professional experience, career position, and participation in continuing professional development are associated with teachers' reflective teaching practices. Tay et al. (2023) emphasized reflective inquiry as a mechanism for instructional improvement, while Montoya Bravo et al. (2026) highlighted the contribution of professional experience and reflective practice to practical teaching knowledge. Sims et al. (2025) further emphasized professional development mechanisms that facilitate the acquisition and application of instructional competence. Similarly, Philp-Clark and Grieshaber (2024) highlighted structured critical reflection in strengthening professional learning. These findings support differentiated professional development, reflective mentoring, and instructional coaching across teachers' career stages.

3.4.3 Relationship Between School Heads' Instructional Evidence-Based Feedback Practices and Teachers' Reflective Teaching Practices

The analysis revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices (r = 0.364, p < 0.001). The reported correlation coefficient indicates a moderate positive association, suggesting that higher instructional feedback practice scores were associated with higher reflective teaching practice scores. Accordingly, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the two variables was rejected based on the reported analysis. The findings suggest that meaningful instructional feedback may provide opportunities for teachers to examine classroom practices, evaluate pedagogical decisions, and identify instructional improvement priorities. Poulou et al. (2023) emphasized constructive professional feedback and collaborative engagement as mechanisms for instructional development, while Tay et al. (2023) highlighted transformative reflection in strengthening teachers' professional learning and decision-making. Similarly, To et al. (2023) emphasized feedback literacy in supporting the meaningful interpretation and application of feedback. These findings are further

supported by Levi-Nielsen et al. (2026), whose systematic review established performance feedback as an evidence-based teacher professional development strategy. Nevertheless, the correlational design does not establish a direct causal relationship between instructional feedback and reflective teaching.

3.5 Issues and Challenges Encountered in Instructional Feedback and Reflective Teaching Practices

3.5.1 Challenges in the Provision of Instructional Feedback

Challenges associated with the provision of instructional feedback were assessed as a Great Challenge by school heads (M = 3.95, SD = 0.85) and a Moderate Challenge by teachers (M = 3.11, SD = 1.24). Both groups identified limited time due to administrative and other school responsibilities as their most prominent concern, with ratings of 4.20 (SD = 0.66) among school heads and 3.21 (SD = 1.23) among teachers. Other concerns included scheduling post-observation conferences, gathering sufficient classroom evidence, maintaining constructive professional relationships, and providing individualized feedback. The findings demonstrate that administrative responsibilities and competing workloads may constrain opportunities for meaningful instructional feedback. Gümüş et al. (2024), in their international analysis of school principals' time utilization, identified administrative responsibilities as important considerations in allocating time for instructional leadership. Poulou et al. (2023) likewise demonstrated the value of structured classroom observations and individualized evidence-based feedback in supporting instructional improvement. These findings reinforce the importance of manageable supervisory workloads, dedicated feedback schedules, and systematic classroom evidence collection.

3.5.2 Challenges in the Reception of Instructional Feedback

Challenges associated with the reception of instructional feedback were assessed as a Great Challenge by school heads (M = 3.61, SD = 0.83) and a Moderate Challenge by teachers (M = 2.90, SD = 1.25). Both groups identified the perception of instructional feedback primarily as performance evaluation rather than professional development support as their most prominent concern, with ratings of 3.80 (SD = 0.66) among school heads and 3.03 (SD = 1.27) among teachers. Other concerns included defensiveness, differences in professional perspectives, hesitation to discuss instructional difficulties, and limited openness and mutual trust. The findings suggest that the evaluative perception of instructional feedback may constrain teachers' willingness to engage in meaningful professional dialogue. Poulou et al. (2023) emphasized constructive feedback and supportive professional relationships, while To et al. (2023) highlighted feedback literacy in strengthening educators' interpretation and utilization of feedback. Tay et al. (2023) likewise emphasized openness and reflective thinking in examining instructional practices. Carless (2023) further highlighted the importance of feedback processes that encourage active engagement and iterative improvement. These findings support developmental feedback conferences emphasizing professional trust, mutual understanding, constructive dialogue, and instructional growth rather than performance judgment alone.

3.5.3 Challenges in the Utilization of Instructional Feedback

Challenges associated with instructional feedback utilization were assessed as a Great Challenge by school heads (M = 3.64, SD = 0.94) and a Moderate Challenge by teachers (M = 3.14, SD = 1.28). School heads identified monitoring and sustaining instructional improvements as their most prominent challenge (M = 3.80, SD = 0.66), whereas teachers identified limited time and competing workload demands as their greatest concern (M = 3.19, SD = 1.34). Other challenges included inadequate resources, limited professional support, insufficient follow-up assistance, and difficulties translating recommendations into specific instructional

improvements. The findings indicate that providing and receiving instructional feedback do not necessarily ensure its sustained implementation. Poulou et al. (2023) emphasized structured feedback and continuing professional support in facilitating instructional improvement, while Sims et al. (2025) highlighted professional development mechanisms that sustain the application of newly acquired practices. To et al. (2023) further emphasized feedback literacy in enabling educators to translate feedback into meaningful professional action. LaBrot et al. (2024) likewise examined the generalization of instructional and classroom management practices acquired through consultation and coaching. These findings underscore the importance of protected instructional improvement time, documented action plans, continuing coaching, and systematic progress monitoring.

3.6 Basis for the Proposed Developmental Supervision Model

The findings established that school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices were generally manifested to a Very Great Extent. However, feedback regularity, continuing supervisory support, critical examination of instructional decisions, and sustained application of feedback emerged as areas requiring further development. Significant relationships involving professional experience, training exposure, and the two major research variables provided additional empirical foundations for the proposed model. Organizational constraints, evaluative perceptions of feedback, competing workloads, and difficulties sustaining instructional improvements were likewise identified as important challenges. These findings served as the basis for the proposed REFINE Developmental Supervision Model, which integrates regular supervision, evidence-based classroom observation, developmental feedback dialogue, critical reflection, collaborative goal setting, continuing professional support, and progress evaluation. The proposed model emphasizes instructional supervision as a continuous, collaborative, and developmental process rather than an isolated performance evaluation activity. Its components are consistent with contemporary research emphasizing evidence-based performance feedback, reflective professional learning, instructional coaching, and sustained professional development (Poulou et al., 2023; Tay et al., 2023; Sims et al., 2025; Levi-Nielsen et al., 2026). The effectiveness of the proposed model remains subject to subsequent implementation and validation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that school heads' instructional evidence-based feedback practices and teachers' reflective teaching practices in selected public secondary schools in Southern Leyte were generally manifested to a very great extent. However, feedback regularity, collaborative goal setting, continuing supervisory support, and critical examination of instructional decisions require further strengthening. School heads' age and level of training were significantly associated with their instructional feedback practices, while teachers' professional rank, teaching experience, and training-related characteristics were significantly associated with reflective teaching practices. The significant positive relationship between instructional feedback and reflective teaching underscores the relevance of integrating developmental supervision and professional reflection without implying causality. Nevertheless, administrative responsibilities, competing workloads, evaluative perceptions of feedback, and difficulties sustaining instructional improvements remain important challenges. These findings provided the empirical foundation for the proposed REFINE Developmental Supervision Model, which integrates evidence-based observation, constructive professional dialogue, critical reflection, collaborative goal setting, continuing support, and systematic progress evaluation.

The Schools Division Office should prioritize expert validation and pilot implementation of the proposed REFINE Developmental Supervision Model and provide differentiated capacity-

building activities responsive to school heads' supervisory needs. Public Schools District Supervisors should strengthen technical assistance in evidence-based classroom observation, developmental feedback conferencing, and instructional progress monitoring. School heads should establish manageable supervision schedules, provide timely and constructive feedback, facilitate collaborative goal setting, and ensure continuing coaching and follow-up support. Teachers should strengthen critical reflective practices, actively participate in feedback conferences, examine the reasoning underlying instructional decisions, and systematically apply supervisory recommendations. Master teachers and Learning Action Cell facilitators should institutionalize collaborative reflection, peer mentoring, and needs-based professional learning activities. Moreover, developmental supervision should maintain an appropriate distinction from formal performance evaluation to promote professional trust and openness. Future researchers should evaluate the proposed model's feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness through intervention-based or longitudinal studies and examine additional factors associated with instructional feedback and reflective teaching practices.

The study was limited to 30 school heads and 150 teachers from 30 selected public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Southern Leyte during School Year 2026–2027, restricting the generalizability of findings to other educational contexts. Its descriptive-correlational design established statistical associations but could not determine causal relationships. Data were obtained through questionnaire-based self-assessments and assessments by school heads and teachers, reflecting respondents' perceptions rather than independently observed instructional practices. Furthermore, the proposed REFINE Developmental Supervision Model was developed from empirical findings but had not undergone implementation-based effectiveness testing. Future studies may address these limitations through broader sampling, direct classroom observations, and longitudinal or intervention-based research designs.

5. REFERENCES

Afable, V. B., & Rapada, V. P., Jr. (2026). Assessment of the relationship between school heads' instructional supervisory practices and teachers' work performance. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10*(5), 4275–4284. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500291

Badillo-Tello, A., & Cano-García, E. (2026). Feedback and teaching reflection: Study with participants in initial teacher training. *Educational Studies, 52*(5), 735–753. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2025.2573300

Baluchzada, S. (2023). Effectiveness of reflective teaching on professional development of English as foreign language (EFL) teachers. *MEXTESOL Journal, 47*(3), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v47n3-6

Barnhart, T., Johnson, H. J., & Tekkumru-Kisa, M. (2025). Pre-service teachers notice student thinking: Then what? *Journal of Teacher Education, 76*(1), 57–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231220604

Brummer, L., de Boer, H., Mouw, J. M., & Strijbos, J. W. (2024). A meta-analysis of the effects of context, content, and task factors of digitally delivered instructional feedback on learning performance. *Learning Environments Research, 27*(3), 453–476. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-024-09501-4

Carless, D. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy, feedback regimes and iterative change: Towards enhanced value in feedback processes. *Higher Education Research & Development, 42*(8), 1890–1904. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2203472

Dayagbil, F., & Alda, R. (2024). Continuing professional development opportunities: Teachers' motivation and perceived effectiveness. *International Journal of Education and Practice, 12*(3), 584–595. https://doi.org/10.18488/61.v12i3.3733

de Kleijn, R. A. M. (2023). Supporting student and teacher feedback literacy: An instructional model for student feedback processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 48*(2), 186–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1967283

Department of Education. (2025a). *Guidelines on the implementation of the expanded career progression system for teachers and school heads in the Department of Education* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2025). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2025_024r.pdf

Department of Education. (2025b). *Guidelines on the multi-year performance management and evaluation system (PMES) for teachers from school years 2025–2026 to 2027–2028* (DepEd Memorandum No. 089, s. 2025). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2025_089r.pdf

Dorukbaşi, E., & Cansoy, R. (2024). Examining the mediating role of teacher professional learning between perceived instructional leadership and teacher instructional practices. *European Journal of Education, 59*(3), Article e12672. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672

Etorne, L. I. (2023). Instructional supervision of select school heads in the School Division of Quezon Province: Basis for policy recommendations. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 13*(6), 588–618. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8354103

Flores, M., Sala-Bars, Í., Ortiz, M., & Duran, D. (2024). Does reciprocal peer observation promote the transfer of learning to teaching practice? *Psychology in the Schools, 61*(10), 3873–3890. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23259

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., Ross-Gordon, J. M., & Solis, R. D. (2024). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (11th ed.). Pearson. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED672916

Godes, A. R., & Dioso, E. (2024). School head's instructional supervisory practices and the performance of the teachers: A correlational study. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 23*(7), 857–873. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13310054

Gonio, Y. G., & Bauyot, M. M. (2024). Delving on the experiences of educators on professional development of National Educators Academy of the Philippines: A case study. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50*(6), 627–641. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i61437

Gross Toews, S., Kurth, J. A., Zimmerman, K. N., Mansouri, M. K., Turner, E. L., & Crump, N. (2024). Professional development with emailed practice-based feedback to support teacher-led inclusive small group literacy instruction. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 49*(1), 36–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/15407969231218388

Gümüş, S., Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Lee, M. (2024). A global typology of school principals' time use: Exploring the effects of contextual and individual factors. *International Journal of Educational Research, 125*, Article 102343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102343

He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9*, Article 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0

Hikmat, M. H., Santos, R. F., Suharyanto, S., Maudy, A. G., & Phommavongsa, K. (2023). Toward continuous innovation in teaching: Reflective practice on English teaching of Indonesian and the Philippine teachers. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education, 5*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.23917/ijolae.v5i1.19273

Jamisola, M. P., & Villanueva, H. D. (2026). Experiences of school heads in conducting instructional supervision: A phenomenological study. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10*(6), 4173–4191. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600289

Jazby, D., Widjaja, W., Xu, L., & van Driel, J. H. (2023). Noticing student thinking under pressure in primary mathematics and science lessons. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 21*, 645–666. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-022-10263-9

LaBrot, Z. C., Smith, T., Maxime, E., & Lawson, A. (2024). School-based consultation and coaching for promoting teachers' generalized outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 107*, Article 101379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2024.101379

Lavigne, A. L., Allen, S., Shao, S., & Acosta Feliz, J. A. (2023). Learning from post-observation conferences: Emerging measures of and mechanisms to improve principals' feedback to teachers. *Journal of Educational Supervision, 6*(3), 25–46. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.6.3.2

Lee, J., Alonzo, D., Beswick, K., Abril, J. M. V., Chew, A. W., & Oo, C. Z. (2024). Dimensions of teachers' data literacy: A systematic review of literature from 1990 to 2021. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 36*, 145–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-024-09435-8

Lefebvre, J., Lefebvre, H., Gauvin-Lepage, J., Gosselin, R., & Lecocq, D. (2023). Reflection on teaching action and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 134*, Article 104305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104305

Levi-Nielsen, S., Dowdy, A., Tobin, R. M., & Schneider, W. J. (2026). A systematic review and single-case meta-analysis of performance feedback as teacher professional development. *Journal of School Psychology, 115*, Article 101527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2025.101527

Leysa, M., & Baynosa, B. (2026). Enhanced instructional supervisory plan for school heads. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 56*(2), 245–273. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.560206

Li, H. (2025). Reflective practice for pre-service teachers' professional development. *SAGE Open, 15*(3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251363136

Locsin, M. R. (2025). Subject group heads' instructional supervision and its effect on the performance of their teachers in Cardona Senior High School: Input for instructional supervision enhancement program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 36*(10), 1116–1120. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.361005

Montoya Bravo, P. E., Nocetti De La Barra, A., & Muñoz Soto, M. C. (2026). Desarrollo profesional docente y su relación con la práctica reflexiva y el saber práctico: Una revisión sistemática de literatura [Teacher professional development and its relationship with reflective practice and practical knowledge: A systematic literature review]. *Educación, 35*(68), 79–104. https://doi.org/10.18800/educacion.202601.a004

Naui, J., Guyong, F., & Vadil, C. (2025). *Development and validation of the Reflective Teaching Approaches Questionnaire (RTAQ) for Asian educational setting* [Preprint]. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5341569

Nhi, H. N. Y., & Thi, N. A. (2026). Fostering reflective practice in EFL teachers: A systematic review of effective strategies and implications for professional development. *rEFLections, 33*(2), 690–710. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v33i2.290232

Octobre, J., & Andal, E. (2025). Clinical instructional supervisory practices: Input to professional growth and development of elementary teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 40*(6), 813–830. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.400605

Paiste, A. L., Perido, D. M., Pasicolan, M. B., Siangco, M. B., Daria, M. O., & Talledo, M. R. B. (2026). Guided or guarded: Teachers' experiences on instructional supervision. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10*(2), 5801–5809. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200427

Pastore, S. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, Article 1217167. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1217167

Philp-Clark, C., & Grieshaber, S. (2024). Teacher critical reflection: What can be learned from quality research? *The Australian Educational Researcher, 51*, 697–717. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00619-7

Poulou, M. S., Reddy, L. A., & Dudek, C. M. (2023). Teachers and school administrators' experiences with professional development feedback: The Classroom Strategies Assessment System implementation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1074278. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1074278

Ramos, R. B., & Anonuevo, A. B. (2024). School heads' experiences on the conduct of classroom observation. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50*(9), 167–186. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i91578

Ruelmann, M., Charalambous, C. Y., & Praetorius, A.-K. (2023). The representation of feedback literature in classroom observation frameworks: An exploratory study. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 35*, 67–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-022-09403-0

Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. *Review of Educational Research, 95*(2), 213–254. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480

Stosich, E. L., Thessin, R. A., & Meyers, C. V. (2024). Learning together to lead together: Designing professional learning to strengthen principal and district leadership for school improvement. *American Journal of Education, 130*(2), 301–331. https://doi.org/10.1086/728266

Tay, L. Y., Tan, L. S., & Aiyoob, T. B. (2023). Teacher reflection—Call for a transformative mindset. *Reflective Practice, 24*(1), 27–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2022.2130224

To, J., Tan, K., & Lim, M. (2023). From error-focused to learner-centred feedback practices: Unpacking the development of teacher feedback literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 131*, Article 104185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104185

UNESCO & International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030. (2024). *Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transforming the profession*. UNESCO. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4039006

Velasquez, M. F., Ramirez, P. H., Capajaña, A. G., & Córdova, M. D. C. (2023). Reflective teaching impact upon pre-service English teachers' professional development: A systematic review. *rEFLections, 30*(3), 971–996. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v30i3.269102

Veugen, M. J., Gulikers, J. T. M., & den Brok, P. (2024). Secondary school teachers' use of formative assessment practice to create co-regulated learning. *Journal of Formative Design in Learning, 8*, 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-024-00089-9